

## **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the Office Action mailed May 1, 2007.

### **Claim Rejections**

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Independent claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624 to Teare, et al., (“Teare”). Applicants traverse these rejections, and assert that the Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

Teare cannot anticipate (or render obvious) independent claim 11 because Teare neither discloses (nor even suggests) limitations recited in independent claim 11. Claim 11 recites “an agent for monitoring communications between machines of the computer network and the computer system for communications relevant to a command object of the metadata registry, the agent being configured to modify the command object by adding thereto network address information of machines of the computer network that should participate in a communication affecting the metadata registry to maintain coherency of the metadata registry.” The Action asserts that Teare discloses these limitations, and generally cites column 8, lines 37-53; column 19, lines 12-26, and 40-47; column 20, lines 21-27 and column 26, first

paragraph to support the rejection. Applicants disagree. The cited text reads as follows:

Defining metadata for a network resource, associating the metadata with a network resource, and storing a copy of the metadata on a server that contains the network resource in this manner offers significant advantages. For example, maintenance of the metadata is convenient. Since a copy of the metadata is stored locally on the server that contains the network resource, the metadata can be updated at any time without contacting a central service. As described further herein, a metadata crawler mechanism periodically visits the server to monitor changes in the metadata. If a Name File 64 has changed, after validation, the changes are automatically propagated to the database and the index.

The Index 30 comprises an Index Builder 32 and Index Files 34. The Index Builder 32 is a software program or process that operates in two modes. In the first mode, a Reconstructor process of the Index Builder 32 periodically polls the database 12, discovers changes to the database, and indexes the changed real name records in the Index Files 34. In a second mode, the Index Builder 32 updates the Index Files 34 in real time, based upon a queue of requests to update the indexes. FIG. 4 is a block diagram of a preferred embodiment of the Index Builder 32. Computers labeled GO Machines 100, 102, 104 each run an instance of the Index Builder 32. Each GO Machine 100, 102, 104 is associated with a network interface process M1, M2, Mn of a Queue Agent 92a. The Queue Agent 92a is coupled to a network 106, such as a local area network, and receives requests to build index entries from the Librarian 20. The Queue Agent 92a propagates a copy of each request to one of the network interfaces M1, M2, Mn, which forwards the request to its associated GO Machine 100, 102, or 104. This architecture is highly responsive to external queries, and is fault-tolerant.

Generally, the Resolver 40 functions as a runtime query interface to the metadata that is stored in the Registry 10. The Resolver 40 functions to receive real name requests from services 42, 44, 46, query the index 30 to identify network addresses corresponding to the real name requests, and respond to the services with the network addresses. The Resolver 40 is structured to respond rapidly to query operations and to service millions of requests per day. To maximize response time and ensure scalability, the Resolver 40 does not directly access the database 12 of the

Registry 10 in responding to queries. Instead, the Resolver communicates with the Index 34 that is stored in fast main memory.

An application program running on the Web application server 60a communicates with the Resolver 40 through the Internet 50 over paths 40a, 40b using CGI scripts to generate HTTP requests and responses. The Web application server 60a uses calls to functions provided by the API of the Resolver 40 to communicate along paths 40a, 40b. Using this structure, the Web application server 60a issues requests containing queries to the Resolver 40. In response, the Resolver 40 evaluates the query, queries the Index 30, and creates a set of metadata for all Index entries reflecting Web pages that match the query. The set of metadata is packaged as an XML file and delivered to the Web application server 60a by the Resolver 40. The Web application server 60a has an XML parser that can parse the XML code in the XML file. Based on the parsed XML code, the Web application server 60a creates one or more HTML documents and delivers the HTML documents to the client 70. The client 70 displays the HTML documents to the end user.

Contrary to the assertion in the Action, nothing in this text discloses (nor even suggests) an agent for monitoring communications between machines of the computer network and the computer system for communications relevant to a command object of the metadata registry, much less an arrangement in which the agent is configured to modify the command object by adding thereto network address information of machines of the computer network that should participate in a communication affecting the metadata registry to maintain coherency of the metadata registry, as recited in claim 11.

Dependent claims 12-22 depend from independent claim 11, and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

All claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 11, which is allowable as indicated above.

### Double Patenting Rejections

A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to obviate the double patenting rejections.

## **CONCLUSION**

All pending claims are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate allowance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jed W. Caven  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: August 1, 2007

/Jed W. Caven/

Jed W. Caven  
Caven & Aghevli LLC  
Reg. No. 40,551  
(720) 841-9544

Direct correspondence to:  
Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400